

Response to Restriction
Requirement

Appln. No. 10/651,198

- 9 -

August 11, 2004

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action dated June 9, 2004. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Request for Extension of Time

Applicants request that the time for response be extended two months, from July 9, 2004 to September 9, 2004. A check in the amount of \$420 is enclosed to cover the two-month extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17(a)(2).

Response to Restriction

In response to the restriction requirement imposed by the Examiner, applicants hereby provisionally elect, with traverse, species 3, illustrated in Figure 5 as defined on page 2 of the Action.

Claims 1-31 are pending. Consonant with the requirements presented in the Action, applicants hereby identify the following claims as reading on the elected species: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 14, 15, 16, 17, 27, 28, 30, 31. Claims 4, 11-13, 18-26 and 29 have been withdrawn and will be canceled, if appropriate, once the finality of the restriction requirement is established.

The Traversal

Applicants respectfully traverse the restriction, contending that Claim 1 is generic. Two criteria are necessary for a claim to be generic. The claim must read on each of the species and include no material element additional to those recited in the species claims (MPEP, Section 806.04(d)).

Claim 1 recites a sleeve assembly comprising a plurality of separate sleeves, positioned lengthwise adjacent to one

Response to Restriction
Requirement

Appln. No. 10/651,198

- 10 -

August 11, 2004

another. Each of the sleeves comprises a sidewall, a pull cord and a means for simultaneously drawing the sleeves through a duct. A comparison of Claim 1 against all of the embodiments illustrated in Figures 1-7 of the application will show that these embodiments contain all of the elements recited in Claim 1. Thus, Claim 1 meets the first requirement because it reads on each of the species as defined by the Examiner. Furthermore, Claim 1 does not include a material element that is not found in any of the species claims. This can be seen by a comparison of Claim 1 with Claim 27, the other independent claim in the application. Claim 1 does not include any elements not found in Claim 27. Thus the second criteria of a generic claim is met.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider his imposition of the restriction in light of the arguments presented and withdraw the requirement, examine all Claims 1-31 and all embodiments as illustrated and described in the application.

Respectfully submitted,

SYNNESTVEDT & LECHNER LLP

By: 

John A. Chionchio
Reg. No. 40,954

1101 Market Street, Suite 2600
Philadelphia, PA 19107-2950
Telephone: (215) 923-4466
Facsimile: (215) 923-2189

JAC/dml
Enclosure